Applicant: Oliver Frick, et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 13909-069001 / 2002P10094

US01

Serial No.: 10/651,302

Filed : August 29, 2003

Page : 6 of 8

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending, with claims 1 and 10 being independent. By virtue of this response, independent claims 1 and 10, along with dependant claims 3, 4, 5, 10, 13, 15, and 17, are amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 3, 4, 13, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, Applicant respectfully submits that the above-mentioned amendments to claims 3, 4, 13, 15, and 17 are made in view of these rejections, and are believed to fully address the rejections. Accordingly, Applicant requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,657,543 to Chung (Chung) Claims 2-9 and 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chung in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,330 to Jones et al. (Jones).

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Chung, Applicant respectfully submits that Chung does not disclose or properly suggest all of the features of independent claim 1, as amended.

For example, independent claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:

reading a radio frequency identification (RFID) tag associated with a user, using an RFID sensor integrated with an information kiosk that has access to situational information that includes information about a plurality of prospective sites;

accessing user information corresponding to the RFID tag;

accessing the situational information to select a subset of the prospective sites based on the user information:

generating an interface providing a personalized agenda to the user for visiting the selected subset of sites. based on the user information, the situational information, and the selected subset of prospective sites; and

outputting the interface to the user using the information kiosk.

Applicant: Oliver Frick, et al. Attorney's Docket No.: 13909-069001 / 2002P10094

US01

Serial No. : 10/651,302 Filed : August 29, 2003

Page : 7 of 8

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action asserts that "...generating an interface is achieved (in Chung) using the display (No. 110) which can be a touch screen to present information to the visitor." However, even assuming for the sake of response that this assertion is correct, Applicant submits that Chung does not disclose or properly suggest, "generating an interface providing a personalized agenda to the user for visiting the selected subset of sites, based on the

user information, the situational information, and the selected subset of prospective sites," as

recited in independent claim 1.

Rather, Chung merely teaches, at best, "a tracking system than can track visitors to various exhibit stations" (see column 2, lines 26-27). Chung does not disclose or suggest the claimed "generating an interface providing a personalized agenda to the user for visiting the selected subset of sites based on the user information, the situational information, and the selected subset of prospective sites." Thus, for example, Applicant's claimed interface may function as an agenda builder, as further recited in, for example, claim 5. In contrast, the referenced interface (110) of Chung merely provides a history of the user's tracking record.

Similarly, independent claim 10 recites, "generate an interface that includes an agenda for visiting a selected subset of the prospective sites customized to the user for presentation on the display." In accordance with the above, Applicant submits that Chung does not disclose or properly suggest at least these features of independent claim 10, so that claim 10 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Finally, Applicant respectfully submits that Jones does not disclose or suggest at least the above-listed claim elements, nor is Jones cited as such.

Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 10 along with their respective dependent claims 2-9 and 11-19, are allowable for at least the above reasons.

Based on the above, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is hereby requested in the Examiner's next official communication.

Applicant: Oliver Frick, et al.

Serial No.: 10/651,302 : August 29, 2003 Filed

: 8 of 8 Page

Attorney's Docket No.: 13909-069001 / 2002P10094

US01

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Reg. No. 46,112

Fish & Richardson P.C. 1425 K Street, N.W.

11th Floor

Washington, DC 20005-3500 Telephone: (202) 783-5070 Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40267838.doc